

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0119 (3597.Palm.SG)

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons which follow.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15-39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hachiman et al. The Examiner stated:

Hachiman et al. teach a docking station for a handheld computer, Figs. 1-17, comprising: a data connection 41 configured to communicate data from the docking station 1 to the handheld computer 2 and a data connection 43 to communicate data from the docking station 2 to a personal computer 400 (inherently comprising as it is well known in the art a communication bus, and coupled to said communication bus a storage device, a memory, and a processor); and an expansion card 600 connector and card reader 57, Fig. 11, coupled to the docking station and configured to communicate data between an expansion card 600 and the docking station 1. Hachiman et al. teach furthermore said docking station having a wireless data link 64, Fig. 11, or a modem data link 500, Fig. 8, to communicate data to a communication network; and a synchronization switch 61 to synchronize data transferred from the card 600 to the PDA and from the PDA to the personal computer 400. Also as it was explained above, the personal computer 400 is inherently provided with a computer program (driver) intended to recognize said cradle card reader (or a serial port of the PDA) and to provide data communication between them.

Independent claims 1, 13, 21, and 35 have all been amended in one form or another to recite that the synchronization cradle includes more than one receptacle for receiving expansion cards including memory cards and other types of expansion card input/output devices or battery devices. Hachiman et al. is assumed to disclose a card 600 inserted into a slot 57 depicted in Figure 11a. Hachiman et al., however, does not

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0119 (3597.Palm.SG)

disclose the use of more than one card slot in a synchronization cradle. The advantage of having multiple card slots as disclosed in Applicant's application is that electronic files may be transferred between multiple memory cards simultaneously inserted into the synchronization cradle. Further, it may be possible to transfer information from a memory card to a card type input/output device such as but not limited to a camera. Further still, utilizing multiple card slots, which was not contemplated by Hachiman et al., allows for transfer of files from a memory card while simultaneously using an input/output device which may be disposed in a card slot. Further still, because the slot may be configured for use as a battery charging receptacle, a battery may be charging in one card slot while a memory card is accessed, the memory card being disposed in another card slot. Accordingly, because the use of multiple card slots in a synchronization cradle is not disclosed in Hachiman et al., independent claims 1, 13, 21, and 35, as amended, are therefore allowable.

Further, Applicants are aware that the application is on final rejection, however, because the claims have been amended to recite a subset of the original claims, that is, more than one slot as opposed to at least one slot, Applicants believe that a new search should not be required by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants request that the amendments to the claims be entered and that all claims be allowed as amended.

Regarding claims 11, 12, 17-19, 33, 34, the Examiner stated:

Hachiman et al. disclose the claimed invention except for: a secure digital card (SD), or a multimedia card (MMC), or a battery, or a cellular phone transceiver, or a camera, or a MP3 player being inserted into a card slot of the docking station (By Hachiman et al. card 600 is a memory card without specifying its kind). Card-type peripheral devices such as cameras, batteries, etc. are well known in the art (Good example is a card-type camera described in the Japanese Patent JP411243501A by Osawa). It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use said card slot to insert a secure digital card (SD), or a multimedia card (MMC), or a battery, or a cellular phone transceiver, or a camera, or a MP3 player, since applicant has not disclosed that a type of the inserted device solves any stated problem or is for any particular

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0119 (3597.Palm.SG)

purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any kind of available electronic device having appropriate size and electrical connection.

The Examiner has stated that claims 11, 12, 17-19, 33 and 34 which are directed to the use of card-type peripheral devices such as cameras, batteries, etc., are well known in the art and that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use the card slots to insert one of the devices and that Applicant has not disclosed such use for any particular purpose. To this assertion, Applicants disagree. Applicants recognize that the use of the card slots for such peripheral devices is a bonus to the typical use of a synchronization cradle for a handheld computer. For example, if a camera card-type device would be disposed into one of the more than one card slots, the camera device could be used via the datalink to the computer as a camera for the computer for such purposes as still photography, videoconferencing, video recording, or the like. Further, Applicants state in paragraph [0026] of the application, "such devices could be accessed and used by a user of computer 110 while such devices are plugged into slots 140. Further, such devices could be accessed and used by a user of handheld computer 130 connected to connector 126 and having devices in slot 140." Accordingly, it is clear that Applicants have disclosed that the inserted devices solve the stated problems and is used for particular purposes. Accordingly, it was not obvious at the time of the Applicant's invention in view of Hachiman et al. and other art including Osawa that providing multiple slots on a synchronization cradle for the insertion of memory cards and other peripheral devices in a card-type fashion was an obvious design choice. Accordingly, dependent claims 11, 12, 17-19, 33 and 34 are therefore allowable.

With regard to claims 35-39, the Examiner indicated that: "The method steps are obviously necessitated by the device structure as Hachiman et al. describe it."

Independent claim 35 has been amended to recite the more than one memory device connector and therefore is not obvious over Hachiman et al. as claims 1, 13, and 21, which are similarly amended. Thus, claims 35-39 are therefore allowable.

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0119 (3597, Palm.SG)

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, and 15-39 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 11, 2003

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER
Suite 3800
777 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-5306
Telephone: (414) 297-5730
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,603

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 11 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800